

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

From the
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

To:
HEATHER JUNE DONALD
SPOOR & FISHER
P.O. BOX 454
PRETORIA, SOUTH AFRICA 0001

PCT

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

(PCT Rule 43bis.1)

		Date of mailing (day/month/year)	25 JUN 2008
Applicant's or agent's file reference PA141964/PCT		FOR FURTHER ACTION See paragraph 2 below	
International application No. PCT/IB07/51947	International filing date (day/month/year) 23 May 2007 (23.05.2007)	Priority date (day/month/year) 07 June 2006 (07.06.2006)	
International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC IPC: G06Q 40/00 (2006.01) USPC: 705/4			
Applicant DISCOVERY HOLDINGS LIMITED			

1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Box No. I	Basis of the opinion
<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. II	Priority
<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. III	Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. IV	Lack of unity of invention
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Box No. V	Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. VI	Certain documents cited
<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. VII	Certain defects in the international application
<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. VIII	Certain observations on the international application

2. FURTHER ACTION

If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA") except that this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.

If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of 3 months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.

For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.

3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.

Name and mailing address of the ISA/ US Mail Stop PCT, Attn: ISA/US Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 Facsimile No. (571) 273-3201	Date of completion of this opinion 09 June 2008 (09.06.2008)	Authorized officer Robert W. Morgan Telephone No. (571) 272-3600
--	---	--

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/IB07/51947

Box No. I Basis of this opinion

1. With regard to the language, this opinion has been established on the basis of:

the international application in the language in which it was filed

a translation of the international application into _____, which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (Rules 12.3(a) and 23.1(b)).

2. This opinion has been established taking into account the **rectification of an obvious mistake** authorized by or notified to this Authority under Rule 91 (Rule 43bis.1(a))

3. With regard to any **nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence** disclosed in the international application, this opinion has been established on the basis of:

a. type of material

a sequence listing

table(s) related to the sequence listing

b. format of material

on paper

in electronic form

c. time of filing/furnishing

contained in the international application as filed.

filed together with the international application in electronic form.

furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.

4. In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table(s) relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.

5. Additional comments:

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.
PCT/IB07/51947

Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43 bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. Statement

Novelty (N)

Claims NONE YES

Claims 1-8 NO

Inventive step (IS)

Claims NONE YES

Claims 1-8 NO

Industrial applicability (IA)

Claims 1-8 YES

Claims NONE NO

2. Citations and explanations:

Claims 1-8 lack novelty under PCT Article 33(2) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent App. Pub. 2005/0256748 to Gore et al.

As per claims 1-8, Gore et al. teaches a method of managing a life insurance policy where the life insurer receives a premium from an insured life and wherein if the insured life suffers an insured event, the life insurer pays a predetermined sum assured to the insured life or a beneficiary nominated by the insured life (see: paragraph 13). Gore et al. further teaches that Typical life insurance policies operate in that an insured life pays a premium to the life insurer and a payout is made to the insured life or their beneficiaries upon the insured life suffering a disability, contracting a dread disease or dying (see: paragraph 2). The payout on these contingencies is collectively termed as risk benefits (see: paragraph 2). Moreover, Gore et al. teaches an exemplary computer system 10 including a processor 12 (e.g., a central processing unit (CPU) a graphics processing unit (GPU) or both) and a memory 14 (see: paragraphs 79-80).

Claims 1-8 meet the criteria set out in PCT Article 33(4), and thus have industrial applicability because the subject matter claimed can be made or used in industry.